



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

a greater war in the future, might prove a worse calamity than the war itself. The most certain assurance against a peace of this kind would seem to be a unanimous agreement between the great powers, entered into during the war, accepting the principle of an international conciliative direction after the war.

Once such an agreement were signed, it would be possible for the great powers, in the treaty of peace, with safety to each and all and without loss of dignity to any, to adjust properly the relations of each to the other and to determine scientifically and fairly the questions concerning the existence, rights and boundaries of the smaller nations and the claims of the nationalities which are aspiring to nationhood. A treaty of peace so made would form a sound basis for the future orderly and peaceful cooperative development of all nations, and would greatly simplify the work of the international directorate which would be formally instituted after the war through a constitutional convention of all nations.

## A WORTHY MEMORIAL

By JAMES J. HALL

**D**R. BENJAMIN F. TRUEBLOOD gave his life for The American Peace Society. He was its untiring Secretary for twenty-five years, and in this capacity traveled to distant lands, labored abundantly, cheered and encouraged peace workers everywhere, and by tongue and pen sought to build up a society destined to bring peace and good-will to all mankind. His name should be perpetuated through all the coming years.

It is now proposed to erect a monument to the memory of this great and good man. The question is, What kind of a monument will be the most worthy of the man and his work?

I submit that there can be no better monument than to endow the American Peace Society so well as to place it beyond the accidents of time and enable it to complete the work which brought it into existence, and for the success of which Dr. Trueblood lived and labored. Could he speak to us, I believe this would be his request.

For no greater good can money be used than to promote universal peace. The world is sorely needing it, the world is longing for it. But it cannot be brought about merely by good wishes and sincere desires. It calls for much money, and persistent and wisely directed effort.

The American Peace Society is well adapted to promote this great end: this is its object, for this purpose it was born, it has never changed its purpose, nor in the stress and strain of war does it fail to keep this end in view.

The American Peace Society has the machinery necessary to accomplish this end. It comes in direct touch with the people, it seeks to create and sustain an enlightened public opinion for world peace, it works harmoniously with every other agency that has this end in view.

The American Peace Society, like every great and worthy cause, needs money. With money it can maintain effectively its departments, divisions, and sections throughout this entire land, and with its carefully prepared literature, able speakers, skillful organizers, touch every part of our civic and national life until all shall

demand universal peace under law and justice; and when this is the demand of our own land the day will hasten when it shall be the demand of all lands and people.

Here then, by an endowment for the American Peace Society, is the opportunity to establish a TRUEBLOOD MEMORIAL worthy of the man and his work. The American Peace Society should have an endowment of at least \$750,000, and could not \$250,000 of this represent Dr. Trueblood's Memorial?

Will not some one blessed with means start it with a \$10,000, or a \$5,000 gift? Can it not be provided for in some will, legacy, or bequest?

The time is now, the need urgent, the opportunity at our door. Let some friend lead the way and the Dr. Benjamin F. Trueblood Endowment begin. Write about it to Arthur D. Call, Secretary, American Peace Society, Washington, D. C.

## A PERSONAL INTERPRETATION OF THE QUAKER VIEW

By EDWARD THOMAS

Chairman, New York Yearly Meeting Peace Committee

**T**HE attitude of the Society of Friends towards war grows out of their other doctrines, all of which may be summed up in the message of George Fox, "There is one, even Christ Jesus, can speak to thy condition." The Friends are a product of the Thirty Years' War and of the Cromwellian Revolution, and the records indicate that Cromwell's soldiers who became Friends were discharged from the army because they refused to carry out cruel orders, or because their listening to the message of Jesus and teaching it to others demoralized the discipline of the army.

George Fox was offered a commission in Cromwell's army. He declined, replying that he sought to live "in the virtue of that life and power that takes away the occasion of all wars."

William Penn said, "God hath placed a principle in every man, to inform him of his duty; . . . Those that live up to this principle are the people of God." The Friends believe that this principle is "a light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." This "light" is manifested in the humanitarian instinct of man, the instinct which in this war as in all wars, persistently triumphs over the fighting instinct to such an extent that troops have to be continually shifted during long lulls in the fighting; for unless their commanders are eternally vigilant the soldiers constantly establish local neutral zones, and local truces with their opponents.

War suppresses this "light." The soldier and the citizen in America must not indulge in more than "academic discussions of peace." Acquiescence in the action of the nation, whether right or wrong, is regarded as the only patriotism. But Friends feel that devotion to the highest interests of our country and loyalty to truth, alike require that "we obey God rather than men."

The Friends first formally enunciated their peace principle in 1660, when they wrote to Charles II, "The spirit of Christ, which leads us into all truth, will never

move us to fight and war against any man with outward weapons, neither for the kingdom of Christ, nor for the kingdom of this world."

To many this sounds impractical, but the Friends believe it is worth trying. They remember how five Friends rode unarmed into the camp of the Indians in 1675, and endeavored to settle by arbitration the differences between the Indians and whites. Though they failed then, and King Phillip's War broke out five days later—the bloodiest of the Indian Wars—their courage did not fail and seven years later they established Pennsylvania where Indians and whites were equal before the courts. Though court decisions were often grossly unjust, both sides kept the peace as long as even a minority of Friends ruled. Success of this sort led to the selection of John Archdale, a Quaker, in 1698, to rescue the Carolinas from anarchy and trouble with the Indians. He succeeded where others had failed.

For centuries force was thought to be essential in dealing with the insane, yet during the Napoleonic Wars, the Tukes, Quakers, found out and taught the world how to run an insane asylum on the principle of appealing to the "inner light."

At nearly the same time Elizabeth Fry brought about a similar reformation in prison administration.

Countless people tell us that the "statement of peace terms by the allies" six months ago, by its careful enumeration of wrongs, only served to unite Germans to the support of the government in prosecuting the war as nothing previous had done. We hear hate preached from the pulpits, shouted from platforms, and hailed from recruiting stations. There is at least a doubt that either side will be able to "dictate terms of peace on the battle field," and to attempt that method means sending hundreds of thousands of men to death. Atrocities can be proved, but reciting them will not help end the war, any more than dwelling on errors and sins will settle domestic quarrels.

A wealthy, prominent, and influential German told a friend of mine who was working for the Belgian Relief that he "would give everything he had to end the war," but he knew that Germany could not be crushed, so he was doing his part. Every German my friend met, and they were possibly thousands, agreed with that wealthy German.

If the possibility of ending the war were freely discussed everywhere the millions in every nation who are sick of the war would soon make their voices heard.

Can we afford to cultivate hate, distrust, and malice when after all the Germans are men? When every fanning of the flame of hate serves to postpone the conference which in any event will end this war? When we know that the longer the war continues the more nearly academic becomes the talk of reparation, since Germany is already practically bankrupt?

Loyalty seems to demand that we endeavor to keep our country sane. We have internal problems. A government official last week, referring to drastic police measures against a few anarchists said "this ends anarchism in this country." We must teach that official history, so that he will learn that over-severe methods only fertilize the ground for anarchism.

War brings juvenile crime at home, unprintable conditions in camps, and a host of other evils. We must

endeavor to keep our consciences so clear of the military machine as to be intelligent assets to America, for after all, America is the best country to live in, and we must do our part to make it the best possible America.

## THE ACHIEVEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE

By JAMES BROWN SCOTT

IF NATIONS meet upon terms of equality, and base their relations upon principles of justice, and if in good faith they keep the pledged word, we may expect peace; but if they do not do so, out of a mistaken regard to their own interests, anarchy and destruction must prevail. As Mr. Root said, on May 11, 1908, on the laying of the cornerstone of the International Bureau of American Republics:

"There are no international controversies so serious that they cannot be settled peaceably if both parties really desire peaceable settlement, while there are few causes of dispute so trivial that they cannot be made the occasion of war, if either party really desires war. The matters in dispute between nations are nothing; the spirit which deals with them is everything."

Feeling, as I do, keenly upon these matters, I desire to offer some observations upon the methods whereby justice may enter into the practice of nations; for, if the future is to be different from the past (and who does not hope and pray that it will be?) we must think more of justice and the ways of peace and less of force and the ways of war.

I consider three things as indispensable in any consideration of this subject, and, without an agreement upon them, it is in my opinion a waste of time to discuss international questions and to plan for a happier future. The first is that we regard all nations as equal; the second is that the relations of nations be based upon principles of justice; and the third, that the promises of nations, whether they be embodied in formal documents, such as treaties and conventions, or preserved in informal agreements, be scrupulously kept.

Let me touch briefly on each of these points, and illustrate by concrete examples the sense in which I would have them understood. First, as to equality. We cannot say, and if we do we cannot expect to be believed, that nations are equal in all respects, for we know that they are not. But I do not speak of physical, mental, or moral equality. I have in mind equality before the law, and in this sense I believe, and therefore state, that nations have equal duties and equal rights in and under the law. Indeed, I am unable to conceive of a system of justice which does not recognize legal equality, and I cannot understand how relations not founded upon equality before and under and in the law can be permanent, and it is the permanent things we wish and must have. The truth that inequality finds no place in justice was never better stated than by a great and high-minded, generous, and yet just French statesman at the First Hague-Conference. In speaking of the supposed inequality of the powers Mr. Bourgeois said: "In the weighing of rights and ideas disparity ceases, and the rights of the smallest and the weakest powers count as much in the scales as those of the mightiest." I would like to say that it is only from the smaller states that